

OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Zhang T, Li W, Wei H, Huang Z, Yang J, Zeng H, et al. (2024) Prognostic value of baseline alkaline phosphatase of 177Lu-PSMA radioligand therapy in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS ONE 19(12): e0307826. https://doi.org/ 10.1371/journal.pone.0307826

Editor: Matteo Bauckneht, IRCCS Ospedale Policlinico San Martino, Genova, Italy, ITALY

Received: April 21, 2024

Accepted: July 9, 2024

Published: December 12, 2024

Copyright: © 2024 Zhang et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting information files.

Funding: The author(s) received no specific funding for this work.

Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Prognostic value of baseline alkaline phosphatase of 177Lu-PSMA radioligand therapy in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Tianhe Zhang, Wuxue Li, Haiyang Wei, Zhiheng Huang, Junkai Yang, Hanyi Zeng, Zhiyong Zhou, Xinghua Zhao *

The Second Affiliated Hospital of Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, China

* xiaoxin0409@126.com

Abstract

Background

Current studies have shown inconsistent results regarding the impact of baseline alkaline phosphatase (ALP) levels on the prognosis of metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (mCRPC) patients who undergo 177Lu-prostate-specific membrane antigen (PSMA) radioligand therapy (PRLT). Therefore, a comprehensive meta-analysis is needed to clarify the implications.

Methods

This study was carried out in full compliance with the PRISMA protocol 2020, and a comprehensive search was conducted through PubMed, Web of Science, and Embase for published literature up to April 1st, 2024. Random-effects models were used to assess the correlation between baseline ALP and overall survival (OS) or progression-free survival (PFS) of mCRPC patients treated with 177Lu-PRLT, with a significance level set at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Results

A total of 12 articles were included in this study. The pooled effect estimates for baseline ALP and OS were 1.134 (95% *Cl*: 1.035–1.245), $l^2 = 78.7\%$, P < 0.05. Regarding baseline ALP and PFS, the pooled effect estimate was found to be 2.14 (95% *Cl*: 1.232–3.718), $l^2 = 93.3\%$, P < 0.05. Subgroup analysis revealed minimal heterogeneity among articles using a cut-off value \geq 220U/L when examining the association between baseline ALP and OS; whereas for baseline ALP and PFS, there was also minimal heterogeneity observed among articles that adjusted for confounders.

Conclusion

This meta-analysis demonstrates a significant association between elevated baseline ALP levels in mCRPC patients prior to 177Lu-PRLT treatment and inferior OS and PFS. Timely

monitoring of baseline ALP levels can provide valuable insights for clinical decision-making and patient counseling.

Introduction

Prostate cancer (PCa) is a prevalent malignancy, affecting over 1.2 million individuals annually and resulting in more than 350,000 fatalities worldwide [1]. It ranks as the third leading cause of mortality among men in the United States [2]. At the time of diagnosis, the majority of PCa cases exhibit metastasis. Despite treatment with continuous androgen deprivation therapy, the disease continues to progress, leading to metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (mCRPC). Patients diagnosed with mCRPC typically demonstrate depleted levels of serum testosterone (< 50 ng/dl or 1.7 nmol/L) and persistently elevated levels of prostate-specific antigen (PSA), or progression in imaging [3, 4]. Currently, conventional treatment options for mCRPC include second-generation hormone therapy, radium-223 and chemotherapy [5]. However, there are limited therapeutic alternatives available for patients who do not respond to chemotherapy like docetaxel and whose disease progression is accompanied by elevated PSA levels [6].

Prostate-specific membrane antigen (PSMA) is a type II membrane glycoprotein that exhibits high expression in both dedifferentiated and castration-resistant prostate cancer [7, 8], rendering radiolabelled PSMA imaging invaluable for detecting metastatic prostates cancer [9]. Recently, 177Lu has emerged as an optimal choice of radionuclide for the development of effective PSMA radioligand therapy (PRLT) drugs due to its favorable properties [10]. Currently, a high-affinity radioligand labeled with 177Lu-PSMA-617 has been introduced for treating mCRPC patients and it has demonstrated promising effects [11]. Similarly, another radioligand known as 177Lu-PSMA-I&T has also exhibited efficacy in treating mCRPC patients [12].

A recent meta-analysis of 177Lu-PRLT in patients with mCRPC has demonstrated a common occurrence of PSA decline following treatment, which has been found to be associated with improved prognosis [13]. Furthermore, Bräuer et al. have revealed that baseline alkaline phosphatase (ALP) levels predict prolonged overall survival (OS) and PSA-progression free survival (P-PFS) in end-stage mCRPC patients receiving this therapy [14]. Similarly, studies investigating radium-223 treatment in mCRPC patients have explored the potential role of baseline ALP and PSA as predictors for tumor response to Radium-223, suggesting their utility in guiding clinical management strategies for prostate cancer [15].

ALP is a key enzyme that plays a pivotal role in various physiological processes within the human body [16]. It exhibits widespread distribution across multiple tissues, including bone, liver, and intestine [17]. ALP serves as an indispensable component for normal bone development and growth. An early study showed that ALP is frequently utillized as an early response marker for CRPC with bone metastases, and elevated ALP levels in the initial stages have been associated with poor OS [18]. However, there is inconsistent regarding the impact of baseline ALP levels on the prognosis of mCRPC patients treated with 177Lu-PRLT in these current studies. Therefore, the objective of this meta-analysis was to synthesize existing data to validate the influence of baseline ALP levels on the prognosis of mCRPC patients undergoing 177Lu-PRLT.

Materials and methods

Literature search strategy

A comprehensive search was conducted in PubMed, Web of Science, and Embase for published literature up to 1 April 2024. In order to prevent any potential omissions, we utilized a broad search strategy incorporating the terms ("metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer" OR mCRPC) and (Lutetium-177-PSMA OR ¹⁷⁷Lu-PSMA) and ("overall survival" OR OS OR survival OR "progression-free survival" OR PFS). The titles and abstracts of these articles included in this study underwent independent screening by two authors, followed by downloading of pertinent papers.

The criteria for inclusion and exclusion criteria

The criteria for inclusion were as stated below: (1) The study provides estimates of the effect and 95% confidence interval (*CI*) of baseline ALP levels on OS or PFS in mCRPC patients. (2) The mCRPC patients includes in the study treated with 177Lu-PRLT. (3) The study must be observational, including prospective or retrospective studies.

The criteria for exclusion were as stated below: (1) Repeatedly published literature. (2) Reviews, erratum, comments and articles reporting other indicators or effects. (3) Association between ALR and PFS or outcome with mCRPC patients treated with 177Lu-PRLT was not reported. (4) Inconspicuous outcome effect. (5) Non-English Studies.

Quality assessment and data extraction

This study was conducted in full compliance with the PRISMA protocol 2020 (S1 Table) [19]. The two authors independently screened the articles according to the strict inclusion and exclusion criteria and scored them using the Newcastle-Ottawa scale(NOS). If there was disagreement, another author evaluated the articles. NOS score quality is as follows: NOS score \geq 7 is high quality, 5 ~ <7 is moderate quality, <5 is low quality [20]. Then we extracted data from the final included articles, the information is as follows: the estimate effect and 95% *CI*; first author; hormone or chemotherapy; study type; published date; population; mean/median age; cut-off value and adjusted confounding factors or not. These information was then summarized into a table.

The selection of estimate effect and 95% CI

When both univariate and multivariate analyses are presented in studies regarding the effect of baseline ALP levels on OS or PFS, it is common to select the multivariate analysis results, because it adjusted some potential confounding factors. Then, some studies performed a binary logistic regression analysis with survival outcomes, where the OR was approximately equal to the Hazard Ratio(HR) [21–23]. Finally, some studies classified baseline ALP according to cut-off values, but the trend ratio was inconsistent, so we normalized the estimates and 95% *CI* for studies with cut-off values, that is low concentration vs: high concentration uniformly adjusted to high concentration vs: low concentration.

Statistical analysis

We performed a forest plot to assess the pooled effect estimate and 95% *CI* of baseline ALP on OS and PFS. The funnel plot and Begg's test was utilized to evaluate publication bias among the included studies. The I^2 statistic was employed to measure the heterogeneity among the studies, with $I^2 > 50\%$ or P < 0.05 indicating significant statistical heterogeneity [24]. In this study, a random effects model was used considering the intra and inter study variation. Subgroup analysis was employed to investigate the potential source of heterogeneity, and sensitivity analysis was used to assess whether the research results were reliable (for each study excluded, the pooled effect and 95% *CI* of the other studies were reliable). The statistical

analyses were conducted using the software STATA version 12.1 software (Stata Corp, College Station, TX, USA), with a significance level set at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Results

The literature search process and the basic information of articles included in the study

A comprehensive search was conducted in PubMed, Web of Science, and Embase based on the specified search terms, resulting in a total of 601 records. These comprisied85 records from PubMed, 160 records from Web of science, and 356 records from Embase. Following the removal of duplicates, there were a total of 443 unique records remaining. After carefully reviewing the titles and abstracts and evaluating the remaining articles, only 12 articles were ultimately included in this study (Fig 1 and Table 1) [14, 25-35]. Among these articles, there were 10 articles on 177Lu-PSMA-617, 1 article focused on 177Lu-PSMA-I&T, and 1 article examined both therapies. Out of these articles 11 articles incorporated patients who treated with 177Lu-PRLT following hormone or chemotherapy treatment, while 2 articles did not provide this information. The majority of the articles were retrospective, with only 3 being prospective. The earliest article was published in 2017, and the primary focus of articles was on the period between 2019 and 2021. The average age of participants included in these articles exceeded 65 years old, predominantly concentrated within the range of 70 to 72 years old. 7 articles categorized baseline ALP levels using a cut-off value of 220 U/L, 1 article used a cut-off value of 333 U/L, while others reported estimates and 95% CI for OS or PFS for each incremental increase by either 1U/L or increments of either 50 U/L or 100 U/L. 9 studies relied on univariate analyses, whereas only 4 articles utilized multivariate analyses.

The pooled effect estimates and 95% CI

According to various clinical outcomes, we estimated the impact of baseline ALP on OS or PFS in patients with mCRPC after 177Lu-PRLT treatment. As depicted in Fig 2A and S2 Table in S1 File, a total of 12 studies reported the association between baseline ALP and OS in mCRPC patients. The pooled effect estimate was 1.134 (95% CI: 1.035–1.245), with I^2 = 78.7% and P < 0.05. Additionally, 6 studies provided data on baseline ALP and PFS in mCRPC patients, yielding a pooled effect estimate of 2.14 (95% CI: 1.232–3.718), I^2 = 93.3%, P < 0.05 (Fig 2B and S3 Table in S1 File).

Subgroup analysis

Given the substantial heterogeneity observed in both pooled effect estimates ($I^2 > 50\%$), subgroup analysis was conducted to identify potential sources of heterogeneity, primarily focusing on factors such as average age, adjusted confounding factors or not, cut-off value, effect value, population, publication date and study design. Notably, among studies assessing clinical outcome OS and grouped by a cut-off value $\geq 220U/L$, minimal heterogeneity was observed ($I^2 =$ 52.7%, P = 0.06), andthe pooled effect estimate was 2.13 (1.40-3.23, Fig 3A), but no significant source of heterogeneity was identified based on other factors depicted in S1 Fig in S1 File. Similarly, for studies evaluating clinical outcome PFS, less heterogeneity existed among studies adjusted for confounders compared to those unadjusted ($I^2 = 29.6\%$, P = 0.241), and the pooled effect estimate was 1.99 (1.39-2.84, Fig 3B;), but no notable source of heterogeneity was detected based on other factors presented in S2 Fig in S1 File.



The first internate showing the sereening process for included

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307826.g001

Publication bias and sensitivity analysis

The funnel plot and Begg's test were used to identify potential publication bias. Regarding the clinical outcome of OS, the funnel plot exhibited slight asymmetry, favoring a positive result in Fig 4A. However, the results of Begg's test (t = 0.86, P = 0.395, S4 Table in S1 File) indicated no significant publication bias. In terms of PFS, the funnel plot displayed relative symmetry, and Begg's test yielded non-significant results (t = 1.32, P = 0.188, S4 Table in S1 File), suggesting an absence of publication bias. Furthermore, to assess result stability, we conducted sensitivity

Author	177Lu-PSMA Radioligand	Hormone or chemotherapy	Study type	Published date	Sample size	Mean/Median age	Cut-off Value	Effect value	Adjusted or not	Quality Scores
Khreish et al. [25]	177-Lu-PSMA-617	Reported	Р	2022	254	70.0 (NR)	≥220 U/L	HR	adjusted	8
Barber et al. [26]	177Lu-PSMA-617, 177Lu-PSMA-I&T	Reported	R	2019	83	69.3±8.7	≥220 U/L	HR	adjusted	9
Barber et al. [26]	177Lu-PSMA-617, 177Lu-PSMA-I&T	NR	R	2019	84	70.8± 7.8	≥220 U/L	HR	adjusted	9
Bräuer et al. [14]	177-Lu-PSMA-617	Reported	R	2017	59	72.0 (66.0–76.0)	≥220 U/L	HR	not	9
Yadav et al. [27]	177-Lu-PSMA-617	Reported	Р	2020	121	67.0 (60.7–72.0)	<333 U/L	HR	not	7
Rasul et al. [28]	177-Lu-PSMA-617	Reported	R	2021	61	71.6±6.9	1 U/L	OR	not	8
Ferdinandus et al. [29]	177-Lu-PSMA-617	Reported	Р	2020	50	71.0 (50.0-87.0)	100 U/L	HR	not	8
Rahbar et al. [30]	177-Lu-PSMA-617	Reported	R	2017	104	70.0 (64.0-76.0)	≤220 U/L	HR	not	8
Khreish et al. [31]	177-Lu-PSMA-617	NR	R	2021	51	74.5 (46.0-89.0)	≥220 U/L	HR	not	7
Kessel et al. [32]	177-Lu-PSMA-617	Reported	R	2019	109	72.0 (44.7-87.5)	<220 U/L	HR	not	9
Heck et al. [33]	177Lu-PSMA-I&T	Reported	R	2018	100	72.0 (66.0-76.0)	50 U/L	HR	adjusted	9
Gaal et al. [<u>34</u>]	177-Lu-PSMA-617	Reported	R	2023	91	70.0 (65.0-76.0)	1 U/L	HR	not	7
Has et al. [<u>35]</u>	177-Lu-PSMA-617	Reported	R	2024	121	72.0 (41.0-94.0)	1 U/L	HR	not	9

Table 1. Characteristics of the included articles.

Tab le footnotes: NR, not reported; P, Prospective; R, retrospective

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307826.t001

analyses by excluding each study individually and examining whether it substantially affected the pooled estimates for the remaining studies included in our analysis. As shown in Fig 5, both sensitivity analyses confirmed reliable outcomes.

Discussion

In this comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis, we evaluated the role of baseline ALP in the prognosis of mCRPC patients after 177Lu-PRLT treatment and identified that high baseline ALP levels were a risk factor for the prognosis of OS and PFS after treatment. Recent studies have also revealed abnormal elevation of ALP levels in certain cancer types, such as breast cancer [36], lung cancer [37], gastric cancer [38], and colorectal cancer [39].



Fig 2. Forest plot showing the effect estimate and 95% CI of between baseline ALP levels on the prognosis of mCRPC patients undergoing 177Lu-PRLT: A: OS; B: PFS.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307826.g002

Study		%				
ID	effect (95% CI)	Weight	Study			%
			ID		effect (95% CI)	Weight
Cut off value≥220 U/L						
Khreish et al.	2.00 (1.30, 3.10)	3.86				
Barber1 et al.	1.20 (0.64, 2.27)	1.97	adjusted			
Barber1 et al.	11.70 (2.92, 47.15)	0.44	Marshell at al.	-	4 70 (4 00 0 40)	10.00
Br?uer et al.	3.31 (1.52, 7.19)	1.35	Knreish et al.		1.70 (1.30, 2.40)	18.33
Rahbar et al.	1.82 (1.02, 3.33)	2.23	Barber1 et al.		2.00 (1.14, 3.50)	16.19
Kessel1 et al.	1.67 (0.59, 3.33)	1.10	Perhad at al		2 07 (4 55 0 70)	10.65
Subtotal (I-squared = 52.7%, p = 0.060)	2.13 (1.40, 3.23)	10.95	Barber i et al.		3.87 (1.55, 9.70)	12.05
			Subtotal (I-squared = 29.6%, p = 0.241)	$\langle \rangle$	1.99 (1.39, 2.84)	47.17
Cut off value>333 U/L						
Yadav et al.	0.91 (0.58, 1.39)	3.82				
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	0.91 (0.59, 1.41)	3.82	not-adjusted			
			Yaday, et al		1 00 (0 63 1 57)	17 13
NR			Tadav et al.	T I	1.00 (0.03, 1.07)	17.15
Rasul et al.	0.35 (0.06, 1.92)	0.28	Khreish et al.		- 9.20 (4.60, 13.80)	16.30
Ferdinandus et al.	1.10 (1.00, 1.20)	20.73	Heck et al	-	1 10 (1 00 1 10)	19.40
Heck et al.	1.00 (1.00, 1.10)	24.28	Hock of al.	-		10.10
Gaal et al.	1.00 (1.00, 1.00)	25.95	Subtotal (I-squared = 96.5%, p = 0.000)		2.11 (0.70, 6.34)	52.83
Has et al.	1.30 (1.10, 1.54)	13.99				
Subtotal (I-squared = 73.4%, p = 0.005)	1.05 (0.98, 1.11)	85.23				
			Overall (I-squared = 93.3%, p = 0.000)	$\langle \rangle$	2.14 (1.23, 3.72)	100.00
Overall (I-squared = 78.7%, p = 0.000)	1.14 (1.03, 1.25)	100.00				
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis			NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis			
.0212 1	47.1		.0725	1 1	3.8	

A:OS-subgroup analysis

B:PFS-subgroup analysis

Fig 3. Subgroup analysis based on different variable: A: OS based on cut- off value; B: PFS based on adjusted confounding factors or not.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307826.g003

Furthermore, ALP also holds significance in the assessment of prognosis for other tumors A meta-analysis conducted by Jiang et al. demonstrated a positive correlation between elevated serum levels of ALP and bone-specific alkaline phosphatase with breast cancer metastasis and survival rates [40]. Similarly, high serum ALP levels were significantly associated with lower OS rates among osteosarcoma patients [41].

Although the prognostic value of ALP has been demonstrated in various tumor types, the underlying mechanisms remain unclear. One possible explanation is that ALP serves as a biomarker for bone metastasis, reflecting its progression when cancer begins to spread [42]. Elevated serum levels of ALP have also been observed in hormone-sensitive prostate cancer and are associated with an increased risk of overall mortality and disease progression [43]. Despite undergoing continuous androgen deprivation therapy, prostate cancer can still metastasize,



https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307826.g004

A US				BPFS			
Study omitted	Estimate	[95% Conf.	Interval]	Study omitted	Estimate	[95% Conf.	Interval]
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	1.0010065 1.0010072 1.0010071 1.0010074 1.0010074 1.0010074 1.001007 1.001007 1.001007 1.0010072 1.0010074 1.0010074 1.0010074 1.0010051	1.0005063 1.0005071 1.0005069 1.0005068 1.0005074 1.0005074 1.0005068 1.0005068 1.0005071 1.0005074 1.0005074 1.0005049	1.0015068 1.0015076 1.0015074 1.0015072 1.0015078 1.0015078 1.0015073 1.0015073 1.0015075 1.0015075 1.0025079 1.0025054	1 2 3 4 5 6 Combined	1.1245214 1.1308118 1.1316667 1.1367375 1.1182621 2.0721049 1.1352436	1.0728968 1.0793113 1.0802358 1.0848804 1.0673258 1.6827173 1.0837149	1.1786299 1.1847696 1.1855463 1.1910734 1.1716292 2.5515988 1.1892225
Combined	1.0010073	1.0005072	1.0015077				

B PFS

Fig 5. Sensitivity analysis showed the stability of the results: A: OS; B: PFS.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307826.g005

with most cases progressing to mCRPC [44]. The treatment for mCRPC typically involves second-generation antiandrogens (such as abiraterone or enzalutamide), chemotherapy (including docetaxel or cabataxel), radiopharmaceuticals (like radium-223), and others [45]. A metaanalysis investigating prognostic factors in patients treated with cabataxel for mCRPC revealed that high pre-treatment ALP levels were indicative of poor prognosis [46]. Therefore, there exists a strong correlation between baseline ALP levels and prognosis in mCRPC patients.

Currently, emerging therapies are being utilized for the treatment of patients with mCRPC, and the US Food and Drug Administration has granted approval for the use of 177Lu-labeled PSMA high-affinity radioligand as a radioisotope therapy in mCRPC [33, 47]. Furthermore, treatment with 177Lu-PRLT demonstrated superior PSA response rates and fewer grade 3 or 4 adverse events compared to cabataxel [48]. The administration of 177Lu-PRLT is commonly employed in mCRPC patients who have not responded to conventional regimens like radium-223 or docetaxel, leading to significant improvements in survival outcomes with acceptable toxicity profiles [49]. Current systematic reviews and meta-analyses indicate that mCRPC patients after receiving 177Lu-PRLT treatment exhibited higher declines in prostate-specific antigen levels, lower incidence of toxicities, and prolonged OS [13, 50, 51]. However, there remained a lack of effective initial indicators to predict the prognosis of mCRPC patients treated with 177Lu-PRLT.

This study revealed a significant association between elevated baseline ALP levels and unfavorable outcomes in patients with mCRPC treated with 177Lu-PRLT, particularly in terms of OS and PFS. Despite the presence of substantial heterogeneity among the included studies, subgroup analysis demonstrated that studies employing a cut-off value \geq 220 U/L exhibited minimal heterogeneity, which was more strongly correlated with poor OS. Conversely, for PFS, there was limited inter-study heterogeneity after adjusting for confounding factors. These findings are consistent with Bülbül et al.'s investigation where patients with baseline ALP \geq 120 U/L displayed significantly lower OS and PFS compared to those with baseline ALP<120 U/L [52]. Another study also confirmed that patients presenting baseline ALP \geq 220 U/L experienced shorter survival times [14]. This observation may be attributed to the potential of elevated baseline ALP levels to reflect alterations in the cellular microenvironment within injured tissues [53]. Consequently, assessing baseline ALP levels before 177Lu-PRLT treatment can offer valuable insights into treatment efficacy.

Although our findings demonstrate a significant association between elevated baseline ALP levels and unfavorable OS and PFS in mCRPC patients treated with 177Lu-PRLT, several limitations should be acknowledged: 1. Incomplete data from certain articles led to their exclusion; 2. The limited number of included articles on PFS could be one potential source of publication

bias, and more studies are needed to address this issue; 3. Variations in the cut-off values for baseline ALP among the included articles resulted in substantial heterogeneity. Despite these limitations, given the relative ease of measuring serum ALP levels before treatment, large-scale prospective studies with extended follow-up periods are warranted to elucidate the potential utility of baseline ALP assessment in mCRPC patients undergoing 177Lu-PRLT treatment.

Conclusion

This meta-analysis demonstrates a significant association between elevated baseline ALP levels in mCRPC patients prior to 177Lu-PRLT treatment and inferior OS and PFS. Notably, a baseline ALP threshold of \geq 220 U/L emerges as a robust prognostic indicator for both OS and PFS. Timely monitoring of baseline ALP levels can provide valuable insights for clinical decision-making and patient counseling.

Supporting information

S1 Table. The PRISMA-2020-checklist. (DOCX)

S1 File. Containing S1, S2 Figs and S2-S4 Tables. (DOCX)

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Xinghua Zhao.

Data curation: Tianhe Zhang.

Formal analysis: Tianhe Zhang.

Investigation: Tianhe Zhang.

Methodology: Tianhe Zhang.

Writing - original draft: Tianhe Zhang, Xinghua Zhao.

Writing – review & editing: Wuxue Li, Haiyang Wei, Zhiheng Huang, Junkai Yang, Hanyi Zeng, Zhiyong Zhou, Xinghua Zhao.

References

- Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLO-BOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin. 2018; 68(6):394–424. https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21492 PMID: 30207593.
- Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer Statistics, 2017. CA Cancer J Clin. 2017; 67(1):7–30. <u>https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21387</u> PMID: 28055103.
- Lowrance WT, Murad MH, Oh WK, Jarrard DF, Resnick MJ, Cookson MS. Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer: AUA Guideline Amendment 2018. J Urol. 2018; 200(6):1264–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. juro.2018.07.090 PMID: 30086276.
- Zhu Y, Ye D. Chinese Expert Consensus on the Diagnosis and Treatment of Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer (2019 Update). Cancer Manag Res. 2020; 12:2127–40. https://doi.org/10.2147/CMAR. S236879 PMID: 32273753.
- Nuhn P, De Bono JS, Fizazi K, Freedland SJ, Grilli M, Kantoff PW, et al. Update on Systemic Prostate Cancer Therapies: Management of Metastatic Castration-resistant Prostate Cancer in the Era of Precision Oncology. Eur Urol. 2019; 75(1):88–99. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2018.03.028</u> PMID: 29673712.
- Atiq M, Chandran E, Karzai F, Madan RA, Aragon-Ching JB. Emerging treatment options for prostate cancer. Expert Rev Anticancer Ther. 2023; 23(6):625–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/14737140.2023. 2208352 PMID: 37101345.

- Schülke N, Varlamova OA, Donovan GP, Ma D, Gardner JP, Morrissey DM, et al. The homodimer of prostate-specific membrane antigen is a functional target for cancer therapy. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2003; 100(22):12590–5. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1735443100 PMID: 14583590
- Mesters JR, Barinka C, Li W, Tsukamoto T, Majer P, Slusher BS, et al. Structure of glutamate carboxypeptidase II, a drug target in neuronal damage and prostate cancer. Embo j. 2006; 25(6):1375–84. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.emboj.7600969 PMID: 16467855.
- von Eyben FE, Baumann GS, Baum RP. PSMA diagnostics and treatments of prostate cancer become mature. Clin Transl Imaging. 2018; 6(2):145–8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40336-018-0270-2 PMID: 29670866.
- Emmett L, Willowson K, Violet J, Shin J, Blanksby A, Lee J. Lutetium (177) PSMA radionuclide therapy for men with prostate cancer: a review of the current literature and discussion of practical aspects of therapy. J Med Radiat Sci. 2017; 64(1):52–60. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmrs.227 PMID: 28303694
- Kulkarni HR, Singh A, Schuchardt C, Niepsch K, Sayeg M, Leshch Y, et al. PSMA-Based Radioligand Therapy for Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer: The Bad Berka Experience Since 2013. J Nucl Med. 2016; 57(Suppl 3):97s–104s. https://doi.org/10.2967/jnumed.115.170167 PMID: 27694180
- Schuchardt C, Zhang J, Kulkarni HR, Chen X, Müller D, Baum RP. Prostate-Specific Membrane Antigen Radioligand Therapy Using (177)Lu-PSMA I&T and (177)Lu-PSMA-617 in Patients with Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer: Comparison of Safety, Biodistribution, and Dosimetry. J Nucl Med. 2022; 63(8):1199–207. https://doi.org/10.2967/jnumed.121.262713
- Kim YJ, Kim YI. Therapeutic Responses and Survival Effects of 177Lu-PSMA-617 Radioligand Therapy in Metastatic Castrate-Resistant Prostate Cancer: A Meta-analysis. Clin Nucl Med. 2018; 43(10):728– 34. https://doi.org/10.1097/RLU.00000000002210 PMID: 30059428
- Bräuer A, Grubert LS, Roll W, Schrader AJ, Schäfers M, Bögemann M, et al. (177)Lu-PSMA-617 radioligand therapy and outcome in patients with metastasized castration-resistant prostate cancer. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2017; 44(10):1663–70. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-017-3751-z PMID: 28624848.
- Sonpavde G, Pond GR, Berry WR, de Wit R, Armstrong AJ, Eisenberger MA, et al. Serum alkaline phosphatase changes predict survival independent of PSA changes in men with castration-resistant prostate cancer and bone metastasis receiving chemotherapy. Urol Oncol. 2012; 30(5):607–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urolonc.2010.07.002 PMID: 20888271.
- Haarhaus M, Cianciolo G, Barbuto S, La Manna G, Gasperoni L, Tripepi G, et al. Alkaline Phosphatase: An Old Friend as Treatment Target for Cardiovascular and Mineral Bone Disorders in Chronic Kidney Disease. Nutrients. 2022; 14(10). https://doi.org/10.3390/nu14102124
- Green MR, Sambrook J. Alkaline Phosphatase. Cold Spring Harb Protoc. 2020; 2020(8):100768. https://doi.org/10.1101/pdb.top100768 PMID: 32747588.
- Kamiya N, Suzuki H, Endo T, Yano M, Naoi M, Nishimi D, et al. Clinical usefulness of bone markers in prostate cancer with bone metastasis. Int J Urol. 2012; 19(11):968–79. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-2042.2012.03098.x PMID: 22805007.
- Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. Bmj. 2021; 372:n71. <u>https://doi.org/ 10.1136/bmj.n71</u> PMID: 33782057.
- Stang A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. Eur J Epidemiol. 2010; 25(9):603–5. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10654-010-9491-z PMID: 20652370.
- Zhang J, Yu KF. What's the relative risk? A method of correcting the odds ratio in cohort studies of common outcomes. Jama. 1998; 280(19):1690–1. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.280.19.1690 PMID: 9832001
- VanderWeele TJ. On a Square-Root Transformation of the Odds Ratio for a Common Outcome. Epidemiology. 2017; 28(6):e58–e60. https://doi.org/10.1097/EDE.000000000000733 PMID: 28816709
- VanderWeele TJ. Optimal approximate conversions of odds ratios and hazard ratios to risk ratios. Biometrics. 2020; 76(3):746–52. https://doi.org/10.1111/biom.13197 PMID: 31808145.
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Stat Med. 2002; 21 (11):1539–58. https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.1186 PMID: 12111919
- Khreish F, Ghazal Z, Marlowe RJ, Rosar F, Sabet A, Maus S, et al. 177 Lu-PSMA-617 radioligand therapy of metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: Initial 254-patient results from a prospective registry (REALITY Study). Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2022; 49(3):1075–85. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-021-05525-7 PMID</u>: 34494131.
- 26. Barber TW, Singh A, Kulkarni HR, Niepsch K, Billah B, Baum RP. Clinical Outcomes of (177)Lu-PSMA Radioligand Therapy in Earlier and Later Phases of Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer

Grouped by Previous Taxane Chemotherapy. J Nucl Med. 2019; 60(7):955–62. https://doi.org/10.2967/jnumed.118.216820 PMID: 30683770.

- Yadav MP, Ballal S, Sahoo RK, Tripathi M, Damle NA, Shamim SA, et al. Long-term outcome of 177Lu-PSMA-617 radioligand therapy in heavily pre-treated metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer patients. PLoS One. 2021; 16(5):e0251375. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251375</u> PMID: 33970962.
- Rasul S, Hartenbach M, Wollenweber T, Kretschmer-Chott E, Grubmüller B, Kramer G, et al. Prediction of response and survival after standardized treatment with (177)Lu-PSMA-617 every 46=weeks in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2021; 48 (5):1650–7. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-020-05082-5
- Ferdinandus J, Violet J, Sandhu S, Hicks RJ, Ravi Kumar AS, Iravani A, et al. Prognostic biomarkers in men with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer receiving [177Lu]-PSMA-617. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2020; 47(10):2322–7. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-020-04723-z PMID: 32140802.
- Rahbar K, Boegemann M, Yordanova A, Eveslage M, Schäfers M, Essler M, et al. PSMA targeted radioligandtherapy in metastatic castration resistant prostate cancer after chemotherapy, abiraterone and/ or enzalutamide. A retrospective analysis of overall survival. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2018; 45 (1):12–9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-017-3848-4 PMID: 29026946.
- Khreish F, Wiessner M, Rosar F, Ghazal Z, Sabet A, Maus S, et al. Response Assessment and Prediction of Progression-Free Survival by (68)Ga-PSMA-11 PET/CT Based on Tumor-to-Liver Ratio (TLR) in Patients with mCRPC Undergoing (177)Lu-PSMA-617 Radioligand Therapy. Biomolecules. 2021; 11 (8). https://doi.org/10.3390/biom11081099
- Kessel K, Seifert R, Schäfers M, Weckesser M, Schlack K, Boegemann M, et al. Second line chemotherapy and visceral metastases are associated with poor survival in patients with mCRPC receiving (177)Lu-PSMA-617. Theranostics. 2019; 9(17):4841–8. https://doi.org/10.7150/thno.35759 PMID: 31410185.
- Heck MM, Tauber R, Schwaiger S, Retz M, D'Alessandria C, Maurer T, et al. Treatment Outcome, Toxicity, and Predictive Factors for Radioligand Therapy with (177)Lu-PSMA-I&T in Metastatic Castrationresistant Prostate Cancer. Eur Urol. 2019; 75(6):920–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2018.11.016
- 34. Gaal S, Huang K, Rogasch JMM, Jochens HV, De Santis M, Erber B, et al. Prognostic Value of the De Ritis Ratio for Overall Survival in Patients with Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer Undergoing [177Lu]Lu-PSMA-617 Radioligand Therapy. Cancers. 2023; 15(20). <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/ cancers15204907 PMID: 37894274</u>
- 35. Simsek DH, Kuyumcu S, Karadogan S, Ozkan ZG, Isik EG, Basaran M, et al. Outcome of 177Lu-PSMA Radionuclide Treatment in Advanced Prostate Cancer and Its Association with Clinical Parameters: A Single-Center Experience. Clinical Nuclear Medicine. 2022; 47(8):E521–E8. https://doi.org/10.1097/ RLU.000000000004222 PMID: 35543629
- Chen WZ, Shen JF, Zhou Y, Chen XY, Liu JM, Liu ZL. Clinical characteristics and risk factors for developing bone metastases in patients with breast cancer. Sci Rep. 2017; 7(1):11325. <u>https://doi.org/10. 1038/s41598-017-11700-4</u> PMID: 28900285.
- Zhou Y, Yu QF, Peng AF, Tong WL, Liu JM, Liu ZL. The risk factors of bone metastases in patients with lung cancer. Sci Rep. 2017; 7(1):8970. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-09650-y PMID: 28827719.
- Zhong N, Leng A, He S, Yang M, Zhang D, Jiao J, et al. Surgical outcomes and prognostic factors for patients with gastric cancer spinal metastasis. Cancer Manag Res. 2019; 11:6971–9. <u>https://doi.org/10. 2147/CMAR.S201372 PMID: 31413637.</u>
- Karabulut S, Afsar CU, Khanmammadov N, Karahan L, Paksoy N, Dogan I, et al. Disease characteristics and prognostic factors of colorectal cancer patients with bone metastasis: A real-world data from Turkey. J Cancer Res Ther. 2024. https://doi.org/10.4103/jcrt.jcrt_392_23 PMID: 38261430.
- Jiang C, Hu F, Xia X, Guo X. Prognostic value of alkaline phosphatase and bone-specific alkaline phosphatase in breast cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Biol Markers. 2023; 38(1):25–36. https://doi.org/10.1177/03936155231154662 PMID: 36775971.
- Gu R, Sun Y. Does serum alkaline phosphatase level really indicate the prognosis in patients with osteosarcoma? A meta-analysis. J Cancer Res Ther. 2018; 14(Supplement):S468-s72. <u>https://doi.org/10.</u> 4103/0973-1482.177217 PMID: 29970708
- Ren HY, Sun LL, Li HY, Ye ZM. Prognostic Significance of Serum Alkaline Phosphatase Level in Osteosarcoma: A Meta-Analysis of Published Data. Biomed Res Int. 2015; 2015:160835. <u>https://doi.org/10. 1155/2015/160835 PMID: 26618165.</u>
- **43.** Mori K, Janisch F, Parizi MK, Mostafaei H, Lysenko I, Enikeev DV, et al. Prognostic value of alkaline phosphatase in hormone-sensitive prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Clin Oncol. 2020; 25(2):247–57. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10147-019-01578-9 PMID: 31768692.

- Mohler J, Bahnson RR, Boston B, Busby JE, D'Amico A, Eastham JA, et al. NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology: prostate cancer. J Natl Compr Canc Netw. 2010; 8(2):162–200. https://doi.org/ 10.6004/jnccn.2010.0012 PMID: 20141676
- Henríquez I, Roach M, 3rd, Morgan TM, Bossi A, Gómez JA, Abuchaibe O, et al. Current and Emerging Therapies for Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer (mCRPC). Biomedicines. 2021; 9(9). https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines9091247 PMID: 34572433.
- 46. Yanagisawa T, Kawada T, Rajwa P, Mostafaei H, Motlagh RS, Quhal F, et al. Sequencing impact and prognostic factors in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer patients treated with cabazitaxel: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Urol Oncol. 2023; 41(4):177–91. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urolonc.2022.06.018 PMID: 35970698</u>.
- Fallah J, Agrawal S, Gittleman H, Fiero MH, Subramaniam S, John C, et al. FDA Approval Summary: Lutetium Lu 177 Vipivotide Tetraxetan for Patients with Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer. Clin Cancer Res. 2023; 29(9):1651–7. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-22-2875 PMID: 36469000
- Hofman MS, Emmett L, Sandhu S, Iravani A, Joshua AM, Goh JC, et al. [(177)Lu]Lu-PSMA-617 versus cabazitaxel in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (TheraP): a randomised, open-label, phase 2 trial. Lancet. 2021; 397(10276):797–804. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21) 00237-3 PMID: 33581798.
- Baumgarten J, Groener D, Nguyen Ngoc C, Mader N, Chaurasia M, Davis K, et al. Safety and Efficacy of (177)Lutetium-PSMA-617 Radioligand Therapy Shortly after Failing (223)Radium-Dichloride. Cancers (Basel). 2022; 14(3). https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers14030557
- Sadaghiani MS, Sheikhbahaei S, Werner RA, Pienta KJ, Pomper MG, Gorin MA, et al. 177Lu-PSMA radioligand therapy effectiveness in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. Prostate. 2022; 82(7):826–35. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/pros.24325</u> PMID: 35286735
- Sadaghiani MS, Sheikhbahaei S, Werner RA, Pienta KJ, Pomper MG, Solnes LB, et al. A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of the Effectiveness and Toxicities of Lutetium-177-labeled Prostate-specific Membrane Antigen-targeted Radioligand Therapy in Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer. Eur Urol. 2021; 80(1):82–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2021.03.004 PMID: 33840558.
- Bülbül O, Ünek İT, Kefi A, Tuna EB, Bekiş R. Factors affecting overall survival and progression-free survival in patients with metastatic castration resistant prostate cancer received (177)Lu PSMA I&T therapy. Hell J Nucl Med. 2020; 23(3):229–39. https://doi.org/10.1967/s002449912201 PMID: 33306752.
- Movahedi MM, Karimaghaei GR, Noori A, Atefi M, Mahmoudi T, Gheisari F. Changes in Serum Alkaline Phosphatase, Calcium, and Parathyroid Hormone with Different Doses of Iodine Therapy. Galen Med J. 2022; 11:e2397. https://doi.org/10.31661/gmj.v11i.2397 PMID: 36698694.